



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/931,650	08/15/2001	Debi Mishra	MSI-927US	2837
22801	7590	02/16/2005	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			HO, ANDY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2126	

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/931,650

Applicant(s)

MISHRA ET AL.

Examiner

The Thanh Ho

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/25/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the request for reconsideration filed 9/8/2004.
2. Claims 1-24 have been examined and are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Desrochers U.S Patent No. 6,553,405.

As to claim 1, Desrochers teaches a method comprising receiving an initial code associated with a first framework (web browser receiving byte code from the web server, lines 29-58 column 4), the initial code including a reference to a referenced class (the main Java class holds references to the other classes, lines 39-40 column 4);

converting the initial code to a converted code (the Web browser converts the byte code into the requested Java classes usable by the applet, lines 6-8 column 5) capable of execution on a second framework (web browser hosting applets and providing them with an execution environment, lines 28-30 column 2);

executing the converted code on the second framework (applets being executed on the web browser, lines 38-55 column 2);

detecting a need for the referenced class during execution of the converted code on the second framework (a typical applet running in the execution environment of the Web browser might require at some point in its life to load a new Java class in order to continue its normal operation, lines 38-41 column 2);

loading the referenced class into memory accessible by the second framework (the browser includes an integrated class loader which then converts the byte code stream into a Java class directly usable by the applet, lines 50-55 column 2).

As to claim 2, Desrochers further teaches the initial code comprises an applet (load the main Java class of the applet, line 39 column 4).

As to claim 3, Desrochers further teaches creating a reference type for the referenced class (package named se.ericsson.xxx and se.ericsson.Idap, lines 51-53 column 4).

As to claim 4, Desrochers further teaches the referenced class comprises referenced class code (byte code, line 56 column 4) associated with the first framework.

As to claim 5, Desrochers further teaches converting the referenced class code to a converted class code (the Web browser converts the byte code into the requested Java classes usable by the applet, lines 6-8 column 5) capable of execution on a second framework (web browser hosting applets and providing them with an execution environment, lines 28-30 column 2).

As to claim 6, Desrochers further teaches executing the converted referenced class code on the second framework (applets being executed on the web browser, lines 38-55 column 2).

As to claim 7, it is a computer readable medium claim of claim 1. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above.

As to claim 8, it is a method claim of claims 1 and 4-5. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 4-5 above.

As to claims 9-11, they are method claims of claims 2, 6 and 3, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2, 6 and 3 above.

As to claim 12, Desrochers teaches a user system (user system 12, Fig. 1) comprising an applet class loader (integrated applet class loader, lines 50-53 column 2); a converter (converts, line 51 column 2); a framework (web browser, line 39 column 2).

As to claims 13-14, they are system claims of claim 1. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above.

As to claim 15, Desrochers further teaches a runtime engine (applet running within the web browser, lines 38-41 column 2).

As to claim 16, Desrochers further teaches the framework comprises an application domain (web browser, line 39 column 2; software application programs running on one machine, lines 9-10 column 1).

As to claim 17, Desrochers further teaches the framework comprises a dynamic assembly (the applet requires additional Java classes at that time or on a per-demand basis during the full life of the applet, lines 9-12 column 5).

As to claim 18, it is a system claim of claim 1. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above.

As to claims 19-21, they are system claims of claims 1, 12 and 15, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 12 and 15 above.

As to claim 22, Desrochers further teaches a browser (web browser, line 39 column 2).

As to claim 23, it is a system claim of claim 2. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2 above.

As to claim 24, it is a method claim of claims 1-2. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-2 above.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 9/8/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that Desrochers does not teach two different frameworks (Remarks, lines 14-18 page 10). In response, Desrochers (lines 6-11 column 4) clearly points out that the server does not have to be a Java Web server; other kinds of servers can be used such as one that run Unix. The reference meets the limitation as claimed.

Applicant argued that Desrochers does not teach, "these conventional Java class loaders could be capable of the converting of claims 1-7" (Remarks, lines 17-18 page 11). In response, the applicant argued limitations that are not brought out in the claims.

Applicant argued that Desrochers does not teach a converter (Remarks, lines 13-16 page 13). In response, Desrochers clearly teaches the Web browser converts the byte code into the requested Java classes (lines 50-55 column 2; lines 6-8 column 5). The reference meets the limitation as claimed.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to The Thanh Ho whose telephone number is (571) 272-3762. A voice mail service is also available for this number. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday, 8:30 am – 5:00 pm.

Art Unit: 2126

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents


P.O Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or fax to:

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 872 - 9306.
- OFFICAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 872 - 9306.
- NON OFFICAL faxes should not be signed, please send to (571) 273 - 3762

TTH
February 11, 2005


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100